

DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT
Draft Notes
Local Advisory Council Meeting
March 27, 2003
NW Activity Center, 18100 Meyers, Detroit

Purpose: To brief local community representatives of the progress of the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project.

Attendance: See attached.

Discussion:

Introductions

Mohammed Alghurabi introduced himself and then asked those in the room to do the same. He noted a number of new members of the LAC were in attendance.

Notes of February 20th Meeting

Mohammed Alghurabi asked if there were any comments or changes to the notes of the February 20th meeting. None were offered.

Role of the LAC

Mohammed Alghurabi explained the process that MDOT has undertaken to organize the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project. He indicated that the LAC had a role to help with outreach to the community and to provide input and guidance to the DIFT EIS process, noting that final decisions are to be made by MDOT. Mohammed also explained the other groups involved in the project, including the Steering Committee, the Local Agency Group, as well as the Project Team of MDOT/Federal Highway Administration personnel that coordinates/oversees the DIFT technical work.

Kathryn Savoie asked if there were a roster of the expanded LAC. The roster was distributed. Mohammed asked that if any discrepancies were noticed in the listing, he should be advised.

Josephine Powell indicated that she was representing the Wayne County Executive on the LAC. Mohammed explained that he had received a call from Victoria Innis in the County Executive's office indicating that Ms. Innis was the official representative of Wayne County. Ms. Powell asked if providing a letter about her status on the LAC would be helpful. Mohammed indicated that it would be.

JoAnna El Hajj asked if there were any rules by which the membership was handled because she noted that a number of people originally considered members of the LAC had not been active. Mohammed indicated that he has been in regular communication with many of the members of the LAC, including those who do not attend the meetings, and none indicated that they wished to be removed from the list.

Kathryn Savoie asked if there were any new LAC Members who were community leaders from the areas around the CP/Oak, CN/Moterm and CP/Expressway terminals. Mohammed Alghurabi explained that locally elected state officials had each been asked to appoint a member to the LAC, who could be a community person.

Work Plan

Mohammed Alghurabi explained that the scope of work had been amended to account for potential expansion of the four existing intermodal terminals in the southeast Michigan area. It was also indicated that a Notice of Intent had been published by the Federal Highway Administration in the Federal Register on March 21st. At that point, Mohammed asked Joe Corradino to explain the overall process. Joe Corradino, using a set of graphics, covered the following:

What is intermodal,

?? The Notice of Intent published on March 21st,

?? The history of the project,

?? The overall scope of work,

?? Timing of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement would be produced,

?? Timing of the Final Environmental Impact Statement and the Record of Decision; and,

?? The local impact analysis area around each of the CN/Moterm and CP/Oak terminals.

Bruce King asked if the external transportation needs (road and rail) at the existing terminals would be assessed as they had been for the concept of the consolidated terminal in southwest Detroit. The response was yes.

Olga Savic asked if improvements could be made to the terminal areas without having to expand them thereby avoiding relocating homes and businesses. It was noted that the possibility did exist, particularly in the case of the Livernois-Junction Yard.

Hansen Clarke asked why the meeting was being conducted far away from southwest Detroit. It was indicated that the meeting location was close to two of the intermodal terminals considered for expansion (CP/Oak and CN/Moterm).

Hansen Clarke asked: if a terminal facility doesn't expand, can it still accommodate growth? It was noted that such could be the case, particularly at the Livernois-Junction Yard. Efficiency could be improved there by eliminating the intersection between the railroads and Central and/or Lonyo thereby allowing the terminal to accommodate longer trains.

Hansen Clarke indicated his interest in southwest Detroit and reflected on the growth there during the decade of the 1990s.

Kathryn Savoie inquired whether the Highland Park terminal would be given consideration in the "expand existing terminals" alternative. It was indicated that a railroad area in Highland Park was being studied. Several limiting factors were noted, such as the ability to assemble trains long enough for intermodal purposes. It was also noted that there are a number of railroad sidings throughout the region but they do not provide the opportunity to practically provide intermodal activities.

Olga Savic asked if the Triple Crown or Delray terminals would be looked at for expansion if federal funds were available. Joe Corradino explained that Norfolk Southern had stated at previous public meetings that the Triple Crown and Delray intermodal operations will be transferred to the Livernois Yard. This was an irreversible decision. But, the Delray and Triple Crown terminals would be dedicated to other non-intermodal, railroad uses. Marc Higginbotham confirmed this interpretation of NS's position.

Josephine Powell asked if the railroads were making their business decisions in line with what was being done on the project. It was indicated that key matters that were being developed on the DIFT Project that affect the railroads were being submitted to the railroads for their review. However, this did not imply that the railroads were committed to the project.

Kathryn Savoie asked if a second scoping meeting would be held. It was noted that it would be, likely by mid-June.

Ryan McGee asked who is doing the Environmental Impact Study. It was indicated the team is shown in the work plan (distributed earlier the meeting).

Terminal Issues

The LAC was then asked to review large wall graphics of each intermodal terminal to list their issues/concerns. Following a 20-minute break to define the issues, the group reconvened. The list of issues developed is included in Attachment A. Joe Corradino discussed a list of themes that came out of the public meetings held on February 24th through 27th (see Attachment B). Kathryn Savoie asked if conversations at the public meetings with people that did not wish to provide their comments in writing were documented. Joe Corradino indicated that comment cards were kept by members of the Project Team and those materials provided input to the consultant's database. Those were reflected in the themes (Attachment B). Mohammed Alghurabi also indicated that the Project Team assembled on the day of the last public meeting to review the sense of what was heard at the meetings so the issues discussed could be part of the evaluation process.

Greg Gorno asked Joe Corradino if anything different were heard at the last set of public meetings than had been stated in the past. Joe Corradino responded that most of the same themes arose, although a consent decree affecting the CN/Moterm terminal was an additional piece of information gathered at the meetings.

Olga Savic noted that court reporters have been used in the past to document comments by individual speakers. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that such was the case but not at informal, open-house meetings. Instead, court reporters were used at formal public hearings. Olga Savic

indicated that she is concerned that some comments might not be reflected in the record. Joe Corradino indicated that the official record required by the project will be compiled through review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Specifically, every written comment made on the DEIS must be responded to in preparing the Final Environmental Impact Statement and, therefore, the recommendation of the project.

Jeannean Bryant asked if MDOT were working in conjunction with the Road Commissions to address road deterioration that exists today and how that issue may be worsened with development of the terminals. It was noted that monthly meetings are held that include Wayne County engineering (and, now, representatives of Oakland County as well as Ferndale) to discuss the technical matters of the project. However, the existing condition of the roads is not the focus of the DIFT.

Greg Gorno indicated that a key point of consolidating the intermodal activity at one terminal is to develop special roads only for intermodal trucks. He asserted these would address the deterioration that Jeannean Bryant mentioned as intermodal truck activity could be removed from many streets.

Josephine Powell urged that there be a mechanism created to capture all comments made by individuals. Joe Corradino responded by saying that when meetings are undertaken on the DIFT, notes are prepared for the consultant's records. However, those notes are not public because of the private nature of the conversations.

Gary Pollard indicated that there may be some skepticism in the community as it relates to the DIFT project because of the deterioration of I-96. He noted that USDOT has forecast that truck traffic will grow by 50 percent in the future and stated that it will be difficult to sell a community that things will get better unless existing conditions are improved. Mohammed Alghurabi stressed that the DIFT project was not about the near-term fixes to roadways; however, he noted a member from the MDOT Metro Region Office who was in attendance (Jeff Edwards) can take the comments made about existing conditions back to MDOT for further attention.

Josephine Powell asked how the project would deal with environmental justice issues as there are minority communities surrounding each of the terminals. Joe Corradino explained the process

used in the project to date and indicated that it would be repeated in the future. Martha Gruelle then asked Joe Corradino to articulate his conclusion at the end of the DIFT Feasibility Study as it relates to environmental justice issues at the Livernois-Junction Yard. Joe Corradino indicated that the Feasibility Study (Report No. 4) indicated that doing nothing was worse than consolidating railroad activity at the Livernois-Junction Yard with federal investment in terms of environmental justice. He explained that the federal investment would be targeted at making improvements to: remove intermodal truck traffic from local streets; make improvements to drainage; pave the railroad yard to help with air quality; develop buffers for noise mitigation purposes; and, the like. These improvements would enhance the local communities' relationship with the railroad terminal as compared to doing nothing. Josephine Powell asked, in light of the conclusion that Joe Corradino articulated, if attorneys were involved in the project. Joe Corradino indicated that they were.

JoAnna El Hajj indicated that she had made a request earlier that the LAC meeting be held in Dearborn. Gary Pollard noted that Senator Irma Clark-Coleman was supportive of a meeting in Dearborn as she represented that area.

Air Quality Analysis Discussion with Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision (SDEV)

Joe Corradino indicated that a meeting was held on February 25th with SDEV and that Kathryn Savoie and Martha Gruelle, were in attendance. He asked if either wished to comment. Kathryn Savoie asked for a clarification of how the EIS air quality analysis would be undertaken. Joe Corradino indicated that the analysis would have three parts: 1) a conformity analysis which is done by SEMCOG based on data supplied by the consultant; 2) carbon monoxide concentrations at hot spots around the terminal; and, 3) a qualitative analysis of air toxics. Kathryn Savoie asked if PM_{2.5} data would be included in the EIS. Joe Corradino indicated that PM_{2.5} calculations would be conducted and included in a supporting report to the DEIS. However, consistent with guidance provided by the Federal Highway Administration, the EIS document itself would not cover PM_{2.5}. If the Environmental Protection Agency indicates that PM_{2.5} is subject to a conformity determination, it will be covered in the EIS document itself. Kathryn Savoie indicated that she was very concerned with that position, because asthma is a problem in Detroit. Therefore, PM_{2.5} should be documented in the EIS proper.

Kathryn Savoie also indicated that she was concerned that the air quality analysis was only done for the year 2025. Joe Corradino indicated that the requirement of the Environmental Impact Analysis process is that a horizon year be determined, usually 25 years in the future, at which impacts are measured.

Martha Gruelle indicated confusion about what a horizon year means. Joe Corradino indicated that it is the point in time, usually 25 years in the future, at which all analyses of impacts must be conducted. Martha Gruelle asked if incremental years were being addressed. Joe Corradino indicated that they were not.

Olga Savic asked was there going to be an assessment of the businesses and families who choose not to move to an area because of a railroad terminal. Joe Corradino indicated that, while the data Olga cited was not part of the EIS, there would be an analysis of secondary and cumulative impacts that are “ripple wave” effects associated with a terminal’s development.

Next Meeting

It was indicated that the Project Team would like to conduct a tour of the existing intermodal terminals for the LAC and others. Olga Savic noted that the best times for a tour were either Monday or Friday afternoons.

The next meeting was set for April 29th at 7:00 p.m. The location was yet to be determined. With this, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal
Local Advisory Council Meeting
March 27, 2003

Name	Representing
Chris Brayman	Dearborn Police Department
Jeanean M. Bryant	Commissioner Alisha Bell
Hansen Clarke	State Senator
Michelle DeSouza	State Sen. Samuel "Buzz" Thomas
Greg Gorno	Gorno Trucking
Marc Higginbotham	Norfolk Southern
Bruce M. King	Detroit Dept. Env. Affairs
Gary Pollard	State Senator Irma Clark
Charlie Pritchett	Detroit Fire Department
Olga Savic	Rep. Steve Tobocman
Kathryn Savoie	ACCESS/CBRA
Chuck Tucker	City of Ferndale

OBSERVERS	
Mohammed Alghurabi	MDOT
Micki Blashfield	CENTRA Trucking
Marty Connour	MARS Industries
Joe Corradino	The Corradino Group
Jeff Edwards	MDOT Metro Region
JoAnna El Hajj	ACCESS
Brian Foster	Sterling Corporation
Martha Gruelle	CBRA/SDEV
Jim Hartman	The Corradino Group
Ryan McGee	U of M, Bagley Housing
Sherry Piacenti	MDOT Real Estate
Josephine Powell	Wayne County Environmental
Greg Rappa	14 th Avenue
Harvey Santana	The Corradino Group
Jeff Stewart	State Senator Hansen Clarke

Attachment A

Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project
Local Advisory Council Meeting
March 27, 2003
Terminal Issues as Documented by LAC

Canadian Pacific Expressway Terminal

- ~~///~~ Will government agencies be employed for inspections due to border crossing? At whose expense if employed?

Livernois Junction Yard (CSX/Norfolk Southern) Terminal

- ~~///~~ Update property ownership and use of property
- ~~///~~ Historic? (Arrows pointing to the approximate area of St. Stephens and Stecker streets)
- ~~///~~ Truck traffic disrupting commercial districts on Vernor
- ~~///~~ Without consolidation, truck-only road(s) will not be included. Driving through residential streets would still take place.
- ~~///~~ Increased border security leading to trucks idling longer on the Ambassador Bridge-increased pollution?
- ~~///~~ Runoff and flooding on surrounding streets
- ~~///~~ Air Quality
 - ?? High Asthma rates-in children, adults
 - ?? MDOT not looking at health effects
 - ?? DIFT Impacts ability to attract families to our community
 - ?? Air Quality issues with increased truck traffic? Environmental Justice?
 - ?? Air Quality – Increased trucks/cumulative impacts need to be examined, not just end point 2025.
 - ?? Environmental Justice – Local community is low-income minority immigrant population – Why do we bear the transportation burden for SE Michigan?
 - ?? Objective environmental impact being done by objective environmental scientists?
 - ?? Economic impacts – loss of jobs and businesses from city (bring logistics facility or other economic benefit!)
- ~~///~~ Hazardous material waste
 - ?? Yucca Mountain waste
 - ?? More Homeland Security money (Consolidation creates a bigger target?)
 - ?? Change in land uses induced by expanded yard
- ~~///~~ Acquisition – Loss of Homes Businesses
 - ?? Some people have been moved multiple times in this neighborhood
 - ?? Safety of pedestrians, children, bicyclists and cars on the road with more trucks
 - ?? Localized PM emissions. Paving does not address this issue.

Canadian Pacific/Oak Terminal

- ~~SS~~ Traffic flow at CP/Oak. Where will trucks come and go?
- ~~SS~~ Southfield Road is already congested and has bad roads. Will we get new roads?

Canadian National Moterm Terminal

- ~~SS~~ Traffic Concerns
- ~~SS~~ Noise
- ~~SS~~ Lighting
- ~~SS~~ Undefined area of expansion

Attachment B

DIFT PUBLIC MEETINGS (FEBRUARY 24 THROUGH 27, 2003)

Comment Themes

1. Project has potential for community and industry.
2. Keep the trucks out of the neighborhoods.
3. Improvements needed to freeways in area. Increases in traffic will require sound walls.
4. Need better publicity of public meetings.
5. Open house forum not conducive to residents being heard.
6. Concerned about increased truck traffic.
7. The neighborhoods and residents already deal with problems from the existing terminals, so making them bigger won't help.
8. Concerned about hazardous materials.
9. Concerned about making a busy area like SW Detroit around the Ambassador Bridge even busier.
10. Concerned about air quality.
11. Concerned about property values for those remaining as neighbors to an expanded terminal.